

211

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM No.M-17211 of 2016 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: July 21, 2016

Ravinder

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH**

Present: Mr.Sat Narain Yadav, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

**INDERJIT SINGH, J.**

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.21 dated 17.01.2015 under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 406, 506 and 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Kosli, District Rewari.

Notice of motion

On asking of the Court, Mr.Vikramjit Singh, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and contests the petition.

Police record is also available.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that the allegations are that accused

No.4 told that accused No.5 is a property dealer and he is very much

acquainted with the land in sub-division Kosli area. All the accused took the complainant to the house of accused No.5 Satpal and accused No.1 to 4 assured the complainant that accused No.5 is their friend and his father is Ex-Sarpanch and accused No.5 wants to sell his property. The complainant agreed to purchase that property. An agreement to sell was executed but the sale deed was not executed. Later on, the complainant came to know that actual name of accused No.5 is Satpal alias Rahul and he is not the owner of the property in question.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner is neither witness to the agreement to sell nor the signatory to the agreement.

The petitioner is in custody since 06.01.2016. He is not required for interrogation or investigation purposes as he is in judicial custody. The offences are triable by Judicial Magistrate Ist Class. The trial of the case will take long time. No useful purpose will be served by keeping the petitioner in custody till the final disposal of the case.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, without discussing the facts in minute detail and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal bonds in the sum of ₹50,000/- with one surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

**July 21, 2016**  
Vgulati

**(INDERJIT SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**